



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/991,234

11/17/2001

Ravi Chandra

4906.P094

4890

8791

7590

04/23/2008

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

DIVECHA, KAMAL B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/23/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 09/991,234</p>	<p>Applicant(s) CHANDRA ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner KAMAL B. DIVECHA</p>	<p>Art Unit 2151</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: none.
Claim(s) objected to: none.
Claim(s) rejected: 6-9, 23-25 and 30-33.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/John Follansbee/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 4/4/08 are not persuasive. In summary, in response filed, applicant's argues in substance that the combination of Rekhtar, Alfieri and Jagannath does not disclose maintaining a common EGP table for all VPNs and maintaining a separate IGP tables for each VPNs (remarks, pg. 7-10.

In response to the argument above, Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As admitted by the applicant, Rekhtar discloses maintaining either a separate forwarding table or a common forwarding table, e.g. remarks, pg. 7-8, which may include IGP and EGP entries.

Alfieri discloses maintaining IGP and EGP forwarding entries in a separate tables, e.g. fig. 5. In other words, Alfieri discloses maintaining IGP information separately than EGP information. As such, the combination of Rekhtar and Alfieri discloses either 1) a common IGP for all VPNs and a common EGP for all VPNs, wherein IGP and EGP are maintained in separate tables OR, 2) a separate IGP and a separate EGP table.

Jagannath discloses maintaining separate routing tables as set forth in the previous rejection. As such, the combination of Rekhtar and Alfieri with Jagannath teaches 1) a common EGP table for all VPNs and 2) separate IGP tables for each VPNs, since Jagannath teaches the process of maintaining routing table separately.

Therefore, the combination of Rekhtar, Alfieri and Jagannath does disclose the teachings as set forth above.

Furthermore, the claim fails to teach, disclose or suggest that the IGP tables for each VPNs are maintained separately, i.e. separate data structure. Stated another way, the first and second routing tables could be associated with a single data structure. For example: see applicant specification [0030]: maintaining a single IGP table, [0026]: table can be implemented via combination of data structures.

Regarding the uses and/or advantages in the specification, first, it is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve same advantage or results, See MPEP 2144 (IV), and secondly, the combination would inherently yield the uses as in applicant's disclosure, e.g. see MPEP 2145 (II).

For the at least these reasons, the rejection is maintained.

/Kamal Divecha/
Kamal Divecha
Art Unit 2151